

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Remarks**

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-66, 69-78, 80, 87-89, 94 and 96-126 are pending in the present application. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 12, 15, 16, 41, 63 and 65; canceled claims 11 and 14; and added new claims 110-126. Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application is in condition allowance based on the discussion which follows.

In the Advisory Action of February 6, 2007, it was noted that the Amendment After Final, filed November 27, 2006, overcame all 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections and the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph (written description) rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 12-16, 41, 63, 66, 69-73 and 109. However, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejections in the final Office Action were maintained for claims 3, 10-12 and 65. Specifically, claim 3 was rejected for reciting the genus "agonist of an LPL receptor" and claims 3 and 65 were rejected for reciting the genus "ligand of a class III tyrosine kinase receptor," as allegedly not being described sufficiently in the specification.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 65 so that the aforementioned claims are directed to the incubation of cells with a specific agonist S1P, dihydro S1P, LPA, PAF and SPC. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 65 recite an agonist which is fully supported by the specification as filed, in accordance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Further, with regard to claims 3 and 65, by this Amendment, Applicants have amended the aforementioned claims, defining the ligand of a class III tyrosine kinase receptor to be a PDGF molecule.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claims 3, 10-12 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Finally, in the Advisory Action, the final Office Action rejection to claims 1, 8, 9, 13, 14, 41, 63, 66, 69 and 70 were maintained as being anticipated by Lindquist et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0014662 (hereinafter "Lindquist")) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). However, claim 15, directed to embryonic stem cells, was not rejected based on Lindquist. Accordingly, by this Amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to include the subject matter not previously rejected on prior art grounds based on Lindquist in the independent claims, thereby rendering all claims allowable over Lindquist.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Lindquist does not refer to embryonic stem cells in connection with the use of S1P or LPA receptor agonists. Furthermore, the specification of Lindquist makes it clear that its invention is specifically directed to adult cells in an effort to avoid the use of embryonic stem cells. Accordingly, Lindquist fails to teach or suggest and, in fact, teaches away from the present method, now specifically directed to the use of embryonic stem cells, as described in Lindquist, paragraph [0004]:

For several years, it has been known that neural stem cells exist in the adult mammalian brain. This concept is of particular importance since the adult brain was thought to have very limited regenerative capacity. Moreover, the possibility to use adult-derived stem cells for tissue repair may help to overcome the ethical problems associated with embryonic cell research. Although the generation of neurons and glia can be observed in the adult brain, there is thus far only limited knowledge about stimulation of human neural stem cells *in vitro* and *in vivo*.

(Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, by this Amendment, the preamble of the independent claims have been amended to be specifically directed to the stem cell, which is an embryonic stem cell. In addition, an affirmative step of providing an embryonic stem cell is now recited in the independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that this step is not carried out or described in Lindquist and is in no way suggested by Lindquist.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

**END REMARKS**